

Appl. No. 10/014,273
Response Dated Jan. 9, 2006
Reply to Notice of Non-Compliant Amd of Dec. 9, 2005

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached Annotated Sheets of drawings depict proposed changes to FIG. 1 and FIG. 2. In Figure 1, previously omitted element 41 (DHCP SERVER) has been added and the depicted wireless connection between PDN 40 and Core Network 31 has been realigned to show that the connection to Core Network 31 is through GGSN 35. In Figure 2, PDP Context Activation Request 59 has been corrected to read "Context Activation Response" 59. Also the Packet Data Network (PDN) 40 has been changed to the DHCP Server 41 as it is the server of the network that receives messages and initiates messages. The proposed changes are written in and circled. Upon approval of these changes by the Examiner, Applicants will submit new sheets 1/2 and 2/2, which include FIGs. 1 and 2, to replace the original sheets 1/2 and 2/2.

Attachment: Annotated Sheets 1/2 and 2/2 showing changes circled

Appl. No. 10/014,273
Response Dated Jan. 9, 2006
Reply to Notice of Non-Compliant Amd of Dec. 9, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants submitted an amendment equivalent to the amendment above on December 2, 2005. In response to the form of the Amendment, the US patent and Trademark Office mailed, on December 9, 2005, A Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (37 CFR 1.121). In the Notice mailed December 9, 2005, the Office stated that the December 2 Amendment was non-compliant in that (a) the amendments to the specification needed complete paragraphs showing the changes, (b) the drawings should be properly identified in the margin as Replacement Sheet, New Sheet or Annotated Sheet, and (c) the claims need to be provided with the proper status identifier.

Applicants are filing the enclosed Amendment and Response to Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment in response thereto. The substance of this Amendment and Response to Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment is substantially the same as the Amendment filed December 2, 2005. As to form, Applicants have modified the Amendments to the Specification on pages xx-xx herein to recite complete paragraphs showing the changes. As to the Amendment to the Drawings, Applicants have indicated in the top margin of the two sheets attached hereto that the sheets are ANNOTATED DRAWINGS. Also, as to the Amendments to the Claims, Applicants have changed the status identifiers to recite (original), (currently amended), or (canceled), as appropriate.

Applicants accordingly submit that the Amendment submitted herein is in compliance with 37 CFR §1.121 and, therefore, should be entered. Following are remarks by the Applicant setting out the reasons for allowance of the present application as amended, responding to the Office Action mailed September 2, 2005.

Appl. No. 10/014,273
Response Dated Jan. 9, 2006
Reply to Notice of Non-Compliant Amd of Dec. 9, 2005

With entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 1 to 5, 9, 12 and 17 to 19 have been amended and Claims 6 to 8, 14 to 16 and 20 have been canceled. Claims 1 to 5, 9 to 13 and 17 to 19 remain in the application.

The Examiner has objected to the disclosure due to informalities in the drawings and has suggested a new title for the application. Applicants have amended the title and have amended the specification at pages 2 to 5. Applicants have also proposed amendments to the FIGs. 1 and 2 of the drawings, shown written on the enclosed Annotated Sheets and circled. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's approval of the proposed changes. After the Examiner has approved the suggested changes, Applicants will submit new formal drawings incorporating the approved changes.

The Examiner has also objected to Claim 1 due to a misspelling on line 4. With entry of the foregoing amendment, Applicants have corrected the informality and respectfully request the Examiner to remove his objection to Claim 1.

The Examiner has also rejected Claims 1, 9 and 17 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Bertrand et al. Applicants have amended Claims 1, 9 and 17 and respectfully submit that the Examiner's rejection thereof has been overcome by the amendment of Claims 1, 9 and 17.

Claims 1, 9 and 17 have been amended to add the limitations of the network determining the uniqueness of the unique IP address and the network transmitting a prefix identifying the external network along with the unique IP address. The Examiner has stated that Bertrand et al. FIG. 3 and col. 7, lines 27 to 45 disclose duplicate address detection being performed by the network and cite Bertrand et al. col. 6, line 63 to col. 7, line 4 as disclosing prefix transmission. However, the transmission of a unique IP address and a prefix identifying an external network from whom the IP

Appl. No. 10/014,273
Response Dated Jan. 9, 2006
Reply to Notice of Non-Compliant Amd of Dec. 9, 2005

address has been obtained from a network to a mobile station where the IP address has been determined to be unique by the network as claimed in amended Claims 1, 9 and 17 is neither disclosed nor taught nor disclosed in Bertrand et al. Specifically, a prefix identifying an external network being sent in addition to a unique IP address assigned by the external network is not taught by or suggested in Bertrand et al.

Bertrand et al. discloses that "[i]t is preferable to provide an IP address to the [mobile station] with the same network prefix as the [mobile station's] home address." Col. 7, lns. 2 to 4. In other words, Bertrand et al. teaches away from transmitting a prefix to the mobile station identifying the external network.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 9 and 17, as amended, are not anticipated by Bertrand et al.

Claims 2 to 8, 10 to 16 and 18 to 20 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertrand et al in view of DHCP for IPv6 to Charles Perkins and Jim Bound. Applicants have canceled Claims 6 to 8, 14 to 16 and 20 and, therefore, believe that the rejections thereof have been rendered moot. Applicants believe that the rejection of Claims 2 to 5, 10 to 13, 18 and 19 has been overcome by the amendment of independent Claims 1, 9 and 17, from which dependent Claims 2 to 5, 10 to 13, 18 and 19, as amended, depend and the remarks above.

Bertrand et al, as discussed above, does not teach or disclose sending a prefix to the mobile station identifying the external network. The paper on DHCP for IPv6 also does not teach or disclose a network sending such a prefix. Accordingly, Neither Bertrand et al, the DHCP paper nor the combination thereof teach the transmission of the prefix identifying the external network to the

Appl. No. 10/014,273
Response Dated Jan. 9, 2006
Reply to Notice of Non-Compliant Amd of Dec. 9, 2005

mobile station as claimed in Claims 1, 9 and 17, as amended, from which Claims 2 to 5, 10 to 13, 18 and 19, as amended, depend.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 2 to 5, 10 to 13, 18 and 19, as amended, has been overcome by the amendment of Claims 1 to 5, 9 to 13 and 17 to 19 and are now in condition for allowance.

In view of Applicant's amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Examiner's rejections under 35 USC §102 and §103, have been overcome by the amendment and remarks submitted herein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the application, as amended, is now in condition for allowance, and such allowance is therefore earnestly requested. In addition, if the Examiner believes that a telephone or other conference would be of value in expediting the prosecution of the present application, enabling an Examiner's amendment or other meaningful discussion of the case, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below.

Applicants submitted a timely reply to the Office Action dated September 2, 2005 on December 2, 2005. The US Patent and Trademark Office replied with a Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment mailed December 9, 2005, setting a one month or thirty day period for response. Applicants have submitted this Amendment and Response to Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment within the allotted time and, therefore submit that no fee is due for any extension as this communication is timely filed. If for some reason Applicants have not requested a sufficient extension and/or have not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent abandonment on this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the

Appl. No. 10/014,273
Response Dated Jan. 9, 2006
Reply to Notice of Non-Compliant Amd of Dec. 9, 2005

required time period and/or authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 1/9/06

By: Daniel R. Collopy
Daniel R. Collopy
Reg. No. 33,667

Customer No. 29906
Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz, P.C.
7150 E. Camelback Rd., Suite 325
Scottsdale, Arizona 85251
Phone: (480) 385-5060
Fax: (480) 385-5061

Attachment: Annotated Sheets 1/2 and 2/2 showing changes circled